

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five minutes fifteen seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Would the Senator from Nebraska like 10 minutes, 5 minutes?

Mr. KERREY. Ten minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as an original cosponsor to this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. KERREY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KERREY pertaining to the introduction of S. 722 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

FRESHMAN FOCUS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today as a replacement, pinch-hitting for the Senator from Wyoming, Senator THOMAS, who usually guides this half hour of time for the freshmen. We call this our freshman focus, 11 freshman Republicans who on Tuesday and Thursday mornings come to the Senate floor to talk about issues of importance to the Senate, to the country. Senator THOMAS has done a fine job in doing that. He is at the National Press Club today, so he is not available to do that. But I will do my best to fill in for him and try to lead the discussion this morning with my colleague from Maine and others who will appear on the floor to talk about our theme for today, which was a question I received a lot in town meetings and other meetings when I was back in Pennsylvania, when I was home in the last few weeks: What is ahead for the Senate? What is the Senate going to be doing with not just the Contract With America, but a whole bunch of other things?

So we thought we would take on that question head on: What is the agenda for the Senate? What are we going to be doing? Is it relevant, and how relevant is it, for the American public and what they are concerned about?

I had lengthy discussions at home at these town meetings and I got a good feel that we are on the right track. What is in our sights here in the U.S. Senate is on track with where the American public would like us to go.

The issue we are debating here on the floor today and for the next week or so is an issue of very great importance to the economic well-being of this country, legal reform. We have a much too costly legal system. It is one that makes us uncompetitive and inefficient, and one that is not fair to society as a whole. While we may have people, individuals, who hit the jackpot and win the lottery in some cases, that is not exactly what our legal system should be designed to do. It should

have the societal benefit of spreading risk around, and also creating justice not just for the individual but for society as a whole. I do not think our system achieves that as well as it can, and I think legal reform we are facing here on the Senate floor will be a help to everyone in our society. That, I believe, is very relevant for the average American.

The other thing we are obviously going to be bringing up, that may be somewhat expedited as a result of the tragedy in Oklahoma City, is a crime bill with very tough provisions on antiterrorism that is going to be, I believe, a bipartisan effort. Senator HATCH has talked about moving forward the crime bill, parts of which have passed the House, and moving it to the Senate floor with some tough antiterrorism measures, to quickly respond. Hopefully, the crime bill we are trying to push through will get an expedited path as a result of some of the activities over the last week or so. Hopefully, the Senate can quickly respond. Again, it is a matter of whether the other side is going to allow this body to move in an expeditious though thoughtful way or whether we are going to play delaying tactics and stalling tactics, to be a roadblock to progress.

There are two other things I want to focus on. If I heard about an issue back home from folks who were trying to make a living, small businessmen in particular, it was regulatory reform. More than anything else, having the Government regulators be more reasonable in dealing with the laws that we put forward and for the Congress and for the regulators to work together to put forward regulatory schemes that make common sense, not these overly bureaucratic and harmful procedures we put in place today to overregulate our society. Again, they cause a lot of personal pain and suffering and problems and affect lives in ways that are almost incalculable as a result of the scheme we put in effect over the last 30 or 40 years. We need to look at this, recreate Government anew, do something commonsense oriented to make Government work better for people back home. I believe the regulatory reform measures we will be considering here in the next month or so will go a long way toward doing that.

The last thing we are going to be looking at, and I will combine these two, is we are going to be looking at a tax cut bill and we are going to be looking at a budget resolution that is going to put this country on a road to a balanced budget in 7 years. I know the Senator from Maine is going to talk about this in detail as a member of the Budget Committee. In fact, we are going to have on the floor of the Senate a budget that will bring us to balance in 7 years. We will be able to vote for a balanced budget. I think it is the first time that has been the case, that the majority party in one of the bodies has proposed a balanced budget,

since 1969. So it is in fact historic and it is a great opportunity. It is a great challenge for not only the Members of the Senate, but for this country, to take a step back and look and see what we are going to do, not just to get the numbers to add up right but simply how are we going to save this country? How are we going to provide for some stability and financial future of this country?

This is not about just balancing the budget; this is about saving the country. Because if we do not take this course, if we do not act seriously on this fiscal crisis we are in right now, it is only going to get harder in the future. It does not get easier. Anyone who will tell you we can just put this off a little bit and it will get easier in the future is wrong. The budget deficit gets worse and worse the longer we wait. You jeopardize programs like Medicare and Social Security and every other popular program that is here in Washington by delaying and playing politics with this issue.

I am hopeful we will not play politics, that we will be able to stand up here and have an intelligent debate on the floor of the Senate and talk about what we are going to do to set priorities and put this country on a sound fiscal footing in the future so we can make sure people who are banking on Social Security and Medicare in their retirements, people who need the welfare systems that we have and hopefully will be able to reform, that those systems will be available and are not just going to be squeezed out because of our inability to set fiscal priorities today. The chance of them being squeezed out in the future is not just a possibility, it is a certainty. We will squeeze these programs out, a lot of them, if we do not set our house in order now.

So I am excited about that. I think it is a great opportunity for the Senate to shine, for us to really step forward and have this kind of deliberative discussion about issues at the core of who we are as a country and what direction we are going to take. I am anxious to get ahead, to look ahead at the next few months and see what we are going to do here in the U.S. Senate. I think it bodes well for this country for us to have this kind of aggressive agenda for the American public.

I will be happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I am pleased to be able to join my freshman colleagues in talking about the agenda for the coming weeks and months as we return from our spring recess and have the opportunity to discuss with our constituents exactly what is on their minds. I can assure you, it is the same thing that it was in November.

People are still clamoring for institutional, economic, and political change.

They recognize that some of the monumental achievements that we have already made in the first 100 days, many of the issues that have laid dormant in this institution for years and years, have been acted upon, such as requiring Congress to live by the same rules that apply to the rest of society, stopping the tide of unfunded mandates, and giving the President line-item veto authority. So we have made progress. But they want to continue our assault on the status quo. I cannot think of a better way to demonstrate our commitment to changing the status quo than to show the American people that deficit reduction and balancing the Federal budget is going to be on the top of our agenda.

I know that many people have said here on the floor of the Senate when we were debating a constitutional amendment to balance the budget that we do not need a constitutional amendment, that it is not necessary. Unfortunately, history has just disproved us in that regard because we have had a fiscal losing streak with 26 years of unbalanced budgets. Mr. President, 1969 is the last time in which we had a balanced Federal budget.

I hope that we can disprove history. I hope that we are able as we meet this week in the Senate Budget Committee on Thursday to begin the process of marking up the budget resolution that we will engage in a bipartisan effort to balance the Federal budget. Our goal is to put our budget on a glidepath toward balancing it by the year 2002.

So I hope all who have mentioned that we do not need a constitutional amendment will join us in that effort to ensure that we will in fact have a statutory commitment toward the balancing of the Federal budget.

The administration unfortunately has perpetuated the fiscal status quo with a budget that was submitted by the President several months ago. In fact, back in 1992 the President said he would offer a 5-year budget plan that would balance the Federal budget. He has not done that. He then said that he would reduce the Federal budget deficit by half by 1996. Of course, that has not occurred. Instead, we received a budget that only eliminates one agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, out of a grand total of a budget of \$1.2 trillion. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office reestimated the administration's projections on deficits. And it is quite alarming as well as disturbing when you see the upward trend of the deficits as well as the interest payments. That is what makes our action on the budget deficit and balancing the Federal budget so compelling.

According to the CBO, the 1996 deficit will be \$211 billion, not the \$197 billion projected by the administration. The 1998 deficit will rise to \$231 billion, not the \$196 billion projected by the administration. In 1999, the deficit will reach an estimated \$256 billion, far from the \$197 billion the administration had forecasted. Finally, in the fiscal year

2000, the Congressional Budget Office said the deficit will reach \$276 billion rather than the \$194 billion the administration has projected.

It means according to CBO reestimates that the size of our national deficit over the next 5 years will increase by 55 percent. It will grow from 2.5 percent of the gross domestic product to 3.1 percent of the GDP, which is contrary to what the administration had indicated, that in fact they had said that the deficit would be 2.5 percent of GDP and decline to 2.1 percent of GDP. Obviously, that is not now the reality. The gap between the administration's projections on the deficits and the Congressional Budget Office really amounts to more than \$209 billion that will be spent over the next 5 years; \$209 billion. It is incredible when you consider the fact that by the year 2000 we will in fact have had our revenues exceed the 1995 revenues by \$323 billion.

So you would say then we must have a much smaller deficit in the fiscal year 2000. Well, no. We are not going to. We are going to have a deficit of \$273 billion. It will be \$100 billion more than it will be in 1995, even though we will have \$323 billion more in additional revenue.

We will be spending \$422 billion over the next 5 years. That represents a 28-percent increase during a time when inflation is projected to rise by half that rate.

The administration said it is going to cut the budget over the next 5 years by \$144 billion. In fact, it is being reestimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In fact, the administration's budget will only reduce Federal spending by \$32 billion over the next 5 years, meaning just about \$6 billion a year, thirty-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of total Federal spending, hardly enough, and certainly is not going to put us on a stable fiscal path for the future. And that is what we are talking about, the future for this country because deficits are affecting not only taxes but productivity, savings, the deficit, and employment. It affects all of those categories. We need to be investing in the future. Otherwise, we are going to create a second-rate economy.

That certainly is not exaggerated because 1969, the last time the Federal Government had a balanced Federal budget, the dollar traded for 4 German marks and 360 Japanese yen. And, since then, while the Federal debt has increased by 1250 percent, or \$4.5 trillion, the dollar has lost two-thirds of its value against the mark, and three-fourths against the yen.

I guess in reality what we are saying is that it will continue to cost the American people millions, if not billions, of dollars because the link between a lackluster and unfocused and uncontrolled Federal budget policy and a decline of the dollar is indisputable. In fact, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, told the House Budget

Committee recently that all told a Federal program of fiscal restraint that moves the deficit finances to sounder footing almost surely will find a favorable reception in financial markets. He added that a key element in dealing with the dollar's weakness is to address our underlying fiscal balance. In layman's terms that means only one thing. It means balancing the Federal budget.

So I hope we can work in unison on a Republican and Democratic basis and in conjunction with the administration to produce just that, a balanced Federal budget, not only for this generation but future generations to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, and would also just say in response to the remarks of our colleague from Maine that she has been a long-time advocate beginning with her service in the House of Representatives for sensible fiscal policy, and in particular support for the balanced budget amendment. I just again express my appreciation to her for all of the hard work that she did there and for what she has since carried forward to this body in attempting to get us to support the balanced budget amendment this year. We failed by one vote. But I think, as has been noted, we are going to get it passed sooner or later.

One of the things my constituents told me during the last 2 weeks when I was out in Arizona was that we need to balance the Federal budget. In fact, if there was any one theme that came across during the visits that I had with people all over the State in my tour of the State, it was that the Senate needed to keep up the good work that the House began, and that includes passing the balanced budget amendment. When I asked them what they thought about the first 100 days and the House Contract With America, they were overwhelmingly in support of it.

We traveled during the first week. We got in my old Suburban and traveled to Miami and Globe and Thatcher, and Pima. These are names that are not known to very many of you, but they are little towns in Arizona. We had a town hall meeting in Safford with 130 people one night. They were all just as interested and engaged as you would hope that our American citizens would be on these issues that we have been working on here.

Their primary message was we are appreciative of what the House did. Now you in the Senate need to do the same thing. They were pleasantly surprised when I noted we had already passed three of the contract items here in the Senate. That message had not really gotten out too much. They were also somewhat skeptical that the Senate would do as well as the House, and

in particular with regard to the budget issues.

We went on to the small towns of Willcox, and Benson. These are ranching communities primarily, and regulatory reform is very high on their agenda. They deal with the Federal Government every day because many of them ranch on Federal lands and in other respects have dealings with the Federal Government, which are not always the most pleasant.

So their view was that regulatory reforms, the kind of things that the Senate will be marking up in the Judiciary Committee tomorrow, the Dole regulatory reform bill, are the kind of reforms that they want us to carry forward. Of course, that was done in the House of Representatives as part of its Contract With America.

Then over to Yuma, AZ, up to Flagstaff, AZ, the Grand Canyon, where there is obviously a need to support our National Park System to begin to make it a better experience for the now millions of people who visit the Grand Canyon every year and also to balance very carefully the environmental concerns with the other economic needs of our citizens.

All of these subjects were discussed during these 2 weeks as I went around the State, but there is a sense of optimism that we have actually changed things. There is a desire that we keep going. I think there is still a residuum of skepticism that the Congress really will follow through with these promises, but people are very pleasantly surprised that so far it seems to be happening.

Then finally, Mr. President, when the very tragic events of just a week ago began unfolding in Oklahoma City, it began to remind people all over this country of how unified we are as a people in condemning that kind of violence, in feeling the most heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the tragedy, and for sharing a commitment to bring to justice the people who are responsible.

I spent a good deal of my time, since I serve on both the Intelligence Committee and the Judiciary Committee, talking to people about the threats that are out there and for the need to support the agencies that we count on to prevent these threats or to bring to justice the people responsible when they occur. Our agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we are extremely pleased with the way this investigation has gone so far, but we know that there is much work to be done.

It is important for us to recognize that this does not just happen automatically. It happens because hundreds of dedicated Americans are working very long hours under difficult circumstances to find out what these kinds of groups are up to, to try to prevent them from acting and, when they do, to bring them to justice. We cannot reflect on it just when there is a tragic

event such as this. We have to support these agencies throughout the year and year in and year out.

I am very disturbed by the calls that I have heard in the beginning part of this year from those who would dismantle the Central Intelligence Agency, for example, because the cold war is over, not appreciating the fact that there are hundreds of organizations around the world, some State sponsored, others not, but all of which have in mind conducting the kind of terrorist activities that occurred in Oklahoma City. It can happen from without our borders as well as within, and it is critical that we remember that and support these organizations when the appropriations issues come before us very soon. It is the only way we will be able to bring to justice the people responsible for this kind of heinous activity.

So, Mr. President, it was an Easter recess that was edifying for all of us and at the end something that because of the tragedy I think unified us all in expressing support for the people in Oklahoma City.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his fine remarks and for his zealous participation in trying to get the Senate moving and working. This is a tough place to get activated, but the Senator from Arizona has been a delightful thorn in the side of a lot of folks around here to try to get things going, and I commend him for his activity.

Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes and forty seconds remain.

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee, Senator THOMPSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

NO TIME TO GO LUKEWARM

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania.

I, first of all, wish to also commend the Senator from Arizona. I think his remarks concerning the need for our strong law enforcement agencies was most timely and most eloquent. Before I address the main point I wanted to make, I must reinforce that.

I think too often in this country, whether it be our law enforcement agencies or our military, once we pass a crisis, it is as if we do not need them anymore; once we have won a war, it is as if we do not need the military anymore. And historically we have downsized too rapidly and too much. I think sometimes when things are peaceful here domestically, we feel we do not need a strong CIA, we do not need a strong FBI and law enforcement authorities. These people are out here every day and, as the Senator pointed out, they need our support on a continuous basis. They need the support of the Congress on a continuous basis, not

just when there is a crisis, when people tend to overreact.

So I am very proud of these agencies. We must do everything we can to make sure that they remain strong, not talking about cutting back the budgets of these agencies, certainly not talking about eliminating them as some have done because they have gotten in a little trouble, and certainly they need oversight. But I think the tragic events of the last several days have just gone to underscore the fact that we must remain strong both domestically and with regard to foreign matters.

I was also impressed with what my colleague from Arizona said concerning the time he had over this last recess. I shared many of the same experiences he had. We ran the last campaign based on a very simple notion, and that was the notion of changing the way we do business in this town, in the Congress of the United States. And now we begin to see in newspaper articles, people have gone back home, and the President indicates that some people are not so sure, maybe things are moving too fast, people are not willing to make sacrifices—sure, they want these things done in the broad sense of the word, but when it comes to them, individuals are too selfish to be willing to make any kind of incremental adjustment if it affects them directly; et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

That is not my experience. I have gone back to Tennessee every weekend since I was elected to the Senate. These last few days have been no different than any other days I have spent out in the country, in country stores, in cafes, talking to people. The message that I get consistently is that this is no time to go lukewarm on our basic commitments, on basically what we ran on. It is not time to go soft on our commitment for a balanced budget amendment. It is not time now to get cold feet on deregulation. It is not time to get lukewarm on welfare reform.

These things are our commitments, these things they expect us to follow up on, and they look forward to the leadership that they think we are providing. They only ask that we be fair.

I have never talked to a grandparent in the State of Tennessee who was not willing to make some incremental adjustment if they thought it would go to the benefit of their grandchild. And that is the message we have to bring back here. For all of those among our colleagues and in the media who think that Americans are so individually self-centered and selfish that we are not willing on an individual basis to do the things necessary to make for a stronger country, to make a stronger country for our children and grandchildren, I will have to point out to them that they are very much mistaken. The House of Representatives, of course, has been very active and very busy. They have gotten a lot of attention over their agenda and what they have done.

I would just like to say this. Regardless of what any individual might think about the Contract With America or any particular provision of the contract, the House of Representatives did a very, very significant thing that overshadows any individual provision in that contract or the contract in its totality, and what they did was what they said they were going to do. Never before in the history of this country was a program so plainly and simply laid before the American people which said, if we get elected, this is what we will do.

They got elected and then they went about doing it. Now it has come to the Senate. It has been pointed out many times that the Senate is not the House. It has been pointed out that things will move slower in the Senate because that is what it is designed to do. This is where the coffee is poured into the saucer to cool.

All of that is true. All of that is well and good. I have no problem in spending days on end in the Senate debating the national issues, debating the issues of strong contention where people have legitimate concerns over issues of broad policy that affect the future of this country. I have no problem with debating those matters on end. We do not have any agenda over here except to do the right thing in the right amount of time.

What I have problems with is taking days on end on matters which essentially are not controversial, where at the end of the day they pass by 90 or 95 votes to 5. I see no reason why we should get hung up on delay over here for delay's sake. I hope that does not happen. If we have controversial matters that take days, let us take them. But if we have things that we know the American people want and we know that most of the Members of this body want, I say let us get on with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his fine remarks and very cogent points on a number of issues, particularly his comments on our downsizing too quickly, not just with the military but with our domestic intelligence agencies, law enforcement agencies. I think the Senator has hit the nail right on the head there and I congratulate him for his statements on that matter.

I would like to yield our remaining time that was allocated to us this morning to the Senator from Oklahoma, who I know will be in the Chamber shortly with a resolution concerning the tragedy in his home State of Oklahoma, to talk about the agenda for the future here in the Senate.

Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

THE AGENDA

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the time.

As he stated, in just a few minutes, Senator NICKLES and I will make some comments concerning a resolution that will be voted on at noon today having to do with the disaster that struck Oklahoma less than a week ago.

However, I do think on this subject of the agenda that there is a misconception that is floating around out there that the Senate has not been doing anything because most of the focus has been on the other body. And it is understandable, because that is where most of the activity was. Procedurally, things happen quicker in the House than they do in the Senate.

For those of us who have served in the House of Representatives and are now serving in the U.S. Senate, I can understand for the first time in my lifetime why our Founding Fathers perceived that we should have a bicameral system. And, in fact, things are more deliberate here. And I think it is, without pointing any fingers or being critical, that many things pass the House of Representatives with the understanding that they know that it will get a more thorough examination when it gets to the Senate.

But, having said that, I would have to say that the Senate has done an incredible amount of work. While I cannot document it, I would suggest that the Senate has accomplished more in the first 90 days or the first 100 days of this session than they have at any other time. We passed the line-item veto. We passed congressional accountability, forcing Members of Congress to live under the same laws that they pass. We passed unfunded mandates. Those of us who have previously been mayors of major cities understand that that is a major problem facing the cities and other political subdivisions around the country. And we have done that. We have had moratoriums passed. I really believe that the Senate has acted responsibly, but in a much more deliberative way.

Now the time has been pretty much occupied on what are we going to do on the budget. I think it is somewhat tragic, and I have to be critical of our President. When he talks about the deficit reduction, he makes comments as if we are actually doing something about reducing the debt. And it is a matter of terminology, that if there is anything that can come from this debate, I hope that the American people, and I think they are, are aware right now that we are talking about two different things when you talk about debt and deficit.

In fact, the President's budget that has come in has built into it deficits each year that will have a dramatic increase on our Nation's debt.

I am still of the belief that we in Congress, in both Houses of Congress, as well as the administration, are incapable of fiscally disciplining ourselves in the absence of a balanced

budget amendment to the Constitution. And I really believe it is going to happen. Of course, it did pass the other body, and it lacked one vote of passing in the U.S. Senate.

I would remind those who share my concern for this nonpassage that it is under a motion for reconsideration and that we are going to be able to do something about it, I believe, before this term is over.

So, Mr. President, Senator NICKLES will be joining me in just a moment and we will have an opportunity to talk a little bit about the tragedy that struck my State of Oklahoma.

I yield back my time.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask that I might be allowed to speak for up to 12 minutes on the matter which the Senator from Oklahoma indicated will be the subject of the remaining of our morning debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair.

THE PARANOID STYLE IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as we think and, indeed, pray our way through the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, asking how such a horror might have come about, and how others might be prevented, Senators could do well to step outside the Chamber and look down The Mall at the Washington Monument. It honors the Revolutionary general who once victorious turned his army over to the Continental Congress and retired to his estates. Later, recalled to the highest office in the land, he served dutifully one term, then a second, but then on principle not a day longer. Thus was founded the first republic, the first democracy since the age of Greece and Rome.

There is not a more serene, confident, untroubled symbol of the Nation in all the Capital. Yet a brief glance will show that the color of the marble blocks of which the monument is constructed changes about a quarter of the way up. Thereby hangs a tale of another troubled time; not our first, just as, surely, this will not be our last.

As befitting a republic, the monument was started by a private charitable group, as we would now say, the Washington National Monument Society. Contributions came in cash, but also in blocks of marble, many with interior inscriptions which visitors willing to climb the steps can see to this day. A quarter of the way up, that is. For in 1852, Pope Pius IX donated a block of marble from the Temple of Concord in Rome. Instantly, the American Party, or the Know-Nothings—"I know nothing," was their standard reply to queries about their platform—devised a Papist plot. An installation of the Pope's block of marble would signal the Catholic uprising. A fevered agitation began. As recorded by Ray

Allen Billington in "The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860":

One pamphlet, "The Pope's Strategem: 'Rome to America!' An Address to the Protestants of the United States, against placing the Pope's block of Marble in the Washington Monument" (1852), urged Protestants to hold indignation meetings and contribute another block to be placed next to the Pope's "bearing an inscription by which all men may see that we are awake to the hypocrisy and schemes of that designing, crafty, subtle, far seeing and far reaching Power, which is ever grasping after the whole World, to sway its iron sceptre, with bloodstained hands, over the millions of its inhabitants."

One night early in March 1854, a group of Know-Nothings broke into the storage sheds on the Monument Grounds and dragged the Pope's marble slab toward the Potomac. Save for the occasional "sighting," as we have come to call such phenomena, it was never to be located since.

Work on the monument stopped. Years later, in 1876, Congress appropriated funds to complete the job, which the Corps of Engineers, under the leadership of Lt. Col. Thomas I. Casey did with great flourish in time for the centennial observances of 1888.

Dread of Catholicism ran its course, if slowly. Edward M. Stanton, then Secretary of War, was convinced the assassination of President Lincoln was the result of a Catholic plot. Other manias followed, all brilliantly described in Richard Hofstadter's revelatory lecture "The Paranoid Style in American Politics" which he delivered as the Herbert Spencer Lecture at Oxford University within days of the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Which to this day remains a fertile source of conspiracy mongering. George Will cited Hofstadter's essay this past weekend on the television program "This Week With David Brinkley." He deals with the same subject matter in a superb column in this morning's Washington Post which has this bracing conclusion.

It is reassuring to remember that paranoiacs have always been with us, but have never defined us.

I hope, Mr. President, as we proceed to consider legislation, if that is necessary, in response to the bombing, we would be mindful of a history in which we have often overreacted, to our cost, and try to avoid such an overreaction.

We have seen superb performance of the FBI. What more any nation could ask of an internal security group I cannot conceive. We have seen the effectiveness of our State troopers, of our local police forces, fire departments, instant nationwide cooperation which should reassure us rather than frighten us.

I would note in closing, Mr. President, that Pope John Paul II will be visiting the United States this coming October. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Will's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1995.]

FEVERED MINDS, MARGINAL MEN

(By George F. Will)

The Tennessee marble on the side of the Morgan bank building in lower Manhattan still bears, defiantly, scars inflicted on Sept. 16, 1920, when a horse-drawn wagon loaded with sash weights exploded amid a lunchtime crowd. Among those blown to the pavement was Joseph P. Kennedy. He was one of the fortunate. The blast, which shattered windows over a half-mile radius killed 30 and injured more than 100.

There were no arrests, or explanations. Someone probably had taken too seriously some socialist critique of capitalism, but the incident fed J.P. Morgan Jr.'s many phobias, which included: "The Jew is always a Jew first and an American second, and the Roman Catholic, I fear, too often a papist first and an American second."

Today, as the nation sifts and sorts the many jagged and tangled fragments of emotions and ideas in the aftermath of Oklahoma City, it should remember that this was not America's baptism of lunacy. Bleeding Oklahoma City is a few hundred miles down the road from Pottawatomie in what once was bleeding Kansas, scene of a memorable massacre. John Brown's body lies a-moldering in the grave, but his spirit—massacres in the name of God—goes marching on in the paranoia of a few.

A very few, on society's far fringes. Which is progress. After Brown killed the mayor of Harpers Ferry and seized the arsenal, he was sentenced to be hanged. Yet America's pre-eminent intellectual, Ralph Waldo Emerson, said of him, "That new saint, than whom nothing purer or more brave was ever led by love of men into conflict and death . . . will make the gallows glorious like the cross." Morgan wrote the words above about Jews and Catholics to A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard, of which institution Morgan was an overseer. It is unthinkable that such sentiments could be expressed in such circles today.

Today when the fevered minds of marginal men produce an outrage like the Oklahoma City bombing, some people rush to explain the outrage as an effect of this or that prominent feature of the social environment. They talk as though it is a simple task to trace a straight line from some social prompting, through the labyrinth of an individual's dementia, to that individual's action.

Now, to be sure, it is wise to recognize that ideas, and hence the words that bear them, have consequences. Those who trade in political ideas should occasionally brood as William Butler Yeats did when he wrote this about the civil war in Ireland:

*Did that play of mine send out
Certain men the English shot?
Did words of mine put too great strain
On that woman's reeling brain?
Could my spoken words have checked
That whereby a house lay wrecked?*

However, an attempt to locate in society's political discourse the cause of a lunatic's action is apt to become a temptation to extract partisan advantage from spilled blood. Today there are those who are flirting with this contemptible accusation: If the Oklahoma City atrocity was perpetrated by individuals gripped by pathological hatred of government, then this somehow implicates and discredits the current questioning of the duties and capacities of government.

But if the questioners are to be indicted, the indictment must be broad indeed. It must encompass not only a large majority of Americans and their elected representatives but also the central tradition of American political thought—political skepticism, the pedigree of which runs back to the Founders.

The modern pedigree of the fanatics' idea that America's government is a murderous conspiracy against liberty and decency—a money-making idea for Oliver Stone, director of the movie "JFK"—runs back to the 1960s. Those were years John Brown could have enjoyed, years when the New York Review of Books printed on its cover directions for making a Molotov cocktail, and a student died when some precursors of the Oklahoma City fanatics practiced the politics of symbolism by bombing a building at the University of Wisconsin.

Today, when some talk radio paranoiacs spew forth the idea that the AIDS virus was invented by Jewish doctors for genocide against blacks, it is well to remember that the paranoid impulse was present in the first armed action by Americans against the new federal government. During the Whiskey Rebellion 200 years ago a preacher declared:

"The present day is unfolding a design the most extensive, flagitious and diabolical, that human art and malice have ever invented. . . . If accomplished, the earth can be nothing better than a sink of impurities."

It is reassuring to remember that paranoiacs have always been with us, but have never defined us.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, seeing the distinguished Senators from Oklahoma on the floor, I know we all look to hear from them. I thank the President and yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

DISASTER IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 5 days ago we had a disaster that occurred in Oklahoma. I happened at the time to be in Dallas in a regional meeting on base closure when I got a call from the President of the United States. At that time, the entire Nation, only hours after the blast, was watching as the smoke still had not yet cleared.

The President advised me as to what the Federal Government was doing. He told me about the FEMA team that was coming in, about the FBI, about law enforcement, all having to do with the tragedy, and asked if there was anything more that I could think of that could be done from the Federal level. Of course, I told the President there was nothing else I could think of that could happen, and I proceeded back to Oklahoma.

When you see something like this that happens and you see the resources that are poured in from the Federal Government, the State government, the city government, but then most of all from the individuals, it is, indeed, heart warming. I agree with Billy Graham, during the memorial service, when he made the statement that it draws us together, it brings out the best in people when a tragedy of this nature takes place. It is one thing to watch it on the television, and it is another thing to experience it knowing that you have personal friends that are